



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the Massachusetts Constitution, in drafting which he had so great a share, was the real prototype of that of the United States, and of those now in force in thirty-eight of our states (p. 87).

The essay on the "Authentication of the Declaration of Independence" is one of the first importance, and must be taken as the final word on the question whether any of the signers of the Declaration of Independence signed it on the Fourth of July.

If there is a single thought which stands out particularly in this volume as a challenge to criticism it is that the American became early differentiated from the Englishman by his associative spirit (p. 285). "To the typical Englishman the unit of force was the individual man: to the typical American, it was an organization." Did not our colonial charters plant the associative spirit here? Had we ever a local organization both as minute and as all-pervading as the Saxon tithings and hundreds? Was not the "General Association for King William," in 1696, with the millions of signatures upon its rolls, a genuine product of English character, and was it by his American travels that Cobden learned the need and the good of an "Anti-Corn Law League?"

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

*The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, comprising his Letters, Private and Official, his Public Documents and his Speeches. Edited by his grandson, CHARLES R. KING. Volume V., 1807-1816. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. xv, 563.)

THE tone of this volume is not less pessimistic than the earlier ones, and to judge from King's correspondents, the condition of the country, which in 1801 they declared desperate, continued to degenerate, until it had passed beyond description, and the strongest adjectives and superlatives ceased to yield any satisfaction to the letter-writers. "In 1807," so one asserts, "neither learning, morals nor wisdom seem any longer to be regarded as subjects of popular esteem and favour," the people blindly showing "wilful, stupid confidence" in the President, lulled in "a sleep which really appears like the sleep of death." The letter-writers make very clear the causes and progress of the final breaking-down of the Federalist party. First and foremost it had become strongly unnational. "Our degraded country" is Gore's characterization; "We are not more virtuous than other states," King asserts, and he asks "Are Republics an inferior and debased species of government?" "The importance of America in the scales of Nations has been very much overrated—and when our national vanity is a little lowered, we shall certainly be a more estimable people," is John Trumbull's view, and he adds that America "must expiate her guilt by suffering;" "What is meant when we are told we must be Americans and support our government?" demands Troup. Yet when it came to intrigue and "dealing," the Federalists for the most part do not seem to have been above the very conduct which

they blame so savagely in democracy. Over and over again, the democratic lust of office is dwelt upon, yet, in the Federalist bargain in 1807 concerning Governor Lewis, Troup advises that "we should be reasonable and moderate in our expectation of offices," though he adds with disgust "that some Federalists have been begging, intriguing, and working with all sorts of tools—for office"! while Gore records of Massachusetts that one reason for the waning of Federalism is that "many of the middle-aged and ardent politicians of our Section of Country have become tired of waiting for place and distinction. They sigh to represent the United States at some foreign court, or to enjoy Power and Influence at home"—a hankering which is all the more distressing and discouraging to the leaders because of the growing conviction they express that the Federalists will never again hold or distribute offices. King himself is forced to wonder "to what good purpose do a few impartial and worthy men toil and weary themselves in the public service?" and why they do not "retire from scenes which they cannot improve, and where they behold more clearly the degradation and the shameless corruption of their Country." Gouverneur Morris, the most discouraged of all this band of out-of-office patriots, asks the "serious question, what chance is there of better rulers if the Union be preserved?"

Such views, of course, entailed much discussion of the remedy; and there are many allusions to the breaking-up of the Union. Gore reports that men in Massachusetts were discussing "a declaration next winter that the Union is dissolved." Gouverneur Morris doubts "if it be possible to preserve the Union," and asks, "Must we wait till the Claws of a human Tiger rake our stinking Bowels to look for a Heart?" But it is to be noted that when it came to more definite action, Cabot asserts that he and others attended the Hartford Convention because "a measure of the Sort was necessary to allay the ferment and prevent a crisis," and his unalterable conviction was "that the worst of evils would be a dissolution of the Union, and all the good which could arise from the Convention would be, in case of the total failure of the powers of the Federal Gov't that a sort of organized body would be in existence, which might attempt to provide for the exigencies of the moment, and that all their endeavors were to avoid doing anything." Failing separation, "a reform of the Constitution is proposed," though King, in suggesting it, acknowledges that "I know our political adversaries will say that we aim at a monarchy; perhaps some of our friends even may suspect our views," and one cannot but wonder how the Federalists could hope of attaining a revision, when they could not gain simple majorities in more than a half-dozen of the states, and when, as they themselves noted, every new state admitted to the Union made the Federal cause the more desperate. In this connection it is particularly interesting to note a conversation between the Secretary of War, Armstrong, and King, in 1814, in which the former practically asserts that the government was not in earnest in endeavoring to recruit an army for the conquest of Canada, because "new views are entertained—pains are taken to impress upon the Western States that

Canada is a fertile and desirable country—if acquired by the U. S. that the surplus population of the east will go to Canada, and not as now, to the Western States—that the consequence would be to check their population and prosperity. This will endure till Canada be filled, hence it will be expedient to defer the conquest of Canada until the Western States are fully populated and their vacant lands taken up and settled ;” that, in brief, Armstrong’s opinion was that “the Virginia Dynasty will never allow to you an opportunity to take Canada.”

There are many side and local issues touched upon, and as a whole the documents are of a peculiarly interesting and valuable nature. It is to be noted that as the work advances, the editorial part is slighted and somewhat heedless. Long series of documents are printed without a single comment, and wide breaks are passed over without any word as to what was occurring. Minor details, too, display carelessness. A note on page 492 should have explained that the “Count Surveilliers” was Joseph Bonaparte. There are a good many typographical slips also, as “War” for Tar (p. 66), 1787 for 1797 (p. 107), “Coon” for Corn Market (p. 145), “possess” for profess (p. 366), and “four or five hundred dollars” for four or five hundred thousand dollars (p. 410).

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

*Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War.* By Lieut.-Col. G. F. R. HENDERSON, Major in the York and Lancaster Regiment, Professor of Military Art and History in the Staff College. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Two vols., pp. xiv, 550, 641.)

STONEWALL JACKSON was a normal human being, not a mythological creation. He was a soldier of great ability, activity and daring and not an irresponsible, erratic genius. In manner he was deferential, modest and retiring ; in the presence of women diffident to excess ; he never blustered and even on the field of battle was rarely severe except to incompetency and neglect. He judged himself more harshly than any one else did, but toward the weakness of others he had abundant charity. In religion, he was a quiet Christian gentleman, absolutely liberal and non-sectarian ; he was too catholic to be a bigot and had none of “the presumptuous fanaticism of Cromwell.” Like many another great soldier—Wolfe and Sherman for instance—he was at first thought to be “crazy,” but his foes soon found out that he was always sober and in his right mind. Marvellous and eccentric as many of his movements were they were prompted, as Napoleon said of his own, “not by genius but by thought and meditation.” He made war like a warrior of great brain and moral force, not as Blind Tom makes music, guided by whisperings no one hears but himself.

Until now General Jackson has not been fortunate in his biographers. Cooke’s book was interesting in its day, but when it was written the author had little or no access to reports and necessary data. Written in